DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 542 PS 001 163

By-Marland, Sidney P.

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATION IN THE BIG CITIES AS EXEMPLIFIED BY PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, Urbana, Ill.

Pub Date 68

Note-15p.; Speech given at the 21st Annual Conference for Administrators, National College of Educ., Evanston, Ill., October 6, 1967.

Available from-University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Ill. 61801 ($0.35)

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68

Descriptors-CITY PROBLEMS, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, *EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES, *PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, *PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, RACIAL INTEGRATION, SOCIAL PROBLEMS, TRANSITIONAL CLASSES, URBAN EDUCATION, URBAN SCHOOLS, URBAN YOUTH

Identifiers-Pennsylvania, *Pittsburgh

Racial integration and compensatory education must be used to solve the problems in the big cities. A little boy or a little girl who grows up feeling different from other people and is unable to have access to solutions that would lift him out of his excluded and isolated way of life has every reason to be sick, to be desperate, to be incomplete as a human being. Compensatory programs such as team teaching, transition rooms, preprimary education (including parental preprimary counseling), and expectant unwed mothers' programs can give aid to the members of society who need the extra help. Furthermore, it will take one generation before rehabilitative results can be seen. (JS)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATION IN THE BIG CITIES AS EXEMPLIFIED BY PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

ED022542

PS001163

Occasional Paper
Early Childhood Education ERIC
College of Education The University of Illinois
805 W. Pennsylvania Avenue Urbana, Illinois 61801

Problems and Prospects of Education in the Big Cities As Exemplified by Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Dr. Sidney P. Marland

PS 001163

ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education
College of Education, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois
1968

Speech given by Sidney P. Marland, Superintendent of Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, at the Twenty-First Annual Conference for Administrators, the theme of which was "Early Childhood Education," at National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois, October 16, 1967, as transcribed from audio tapes made at the Conference and edited by William H. Schmidt.

Distributed by the University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois 61801

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATION IN THE BIG CITIES AS EXEMPLIFIED BY PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

The big cities of America are sick. There are great, deep, and increasing problems in the American cities. I hope, as I talk to the people who are influenced by National College — especially the young people who are formulating their own values and career goals — that they will think carefully upon the grave needs in the big cities of America. This is not a recruiting message; it is a value message about how you put your life to work.

The Great Society finds its focus in the big cities of our land, and I hold that if there is any message for you today in the thoughts I would share, it is that education in its fullest sense, and in a much larger definition than most of us even now perceive, will be the ultimate resolution of our great city sickness and that it will probably be the determinant as to whether or not our big cities survive in this land as good places. This is the value concept that I would offer.

We hear Bel Kaufman ponder values as she struggles up the down staircase. "What I really had in mind was to do a little teaching. I had come eager to share all I know and feel, to imbue the young with a love for their language, and to instruct, and to inspire. What happened? Well, that was something else again! And even if I could describe it, you would think I was exaggerating."

I am not going to go into the details of the problems of education in the great cities, but I am going to try to talk to you about how I think education is doing something about them, especially in the context of early childhood and elementary education. If I use Pittsburgh as a case study, it is because that is the only school system of which I have first-hand knowledge. Indeed, I would say that it is quite difficult for a su-

perintendent of schools to leave such a city even for a day to come to such a pleasant event as this. He must almost always be close at hand if he is about his business because the teeming problems are so very constant. I would not go into the problems in detail but would rather talk about constructive things that are happening in response to those problems. I think it is important to say that if we are to construct solutions we must first accept the fact that there are grave, grave issues in the large cities, graver than most people appreciate.

As examples, I am going to cite only two or three quick illustrations of the big city problems that now prevail. Whereas in the past thirty years the average cost per pupil in America has risen some 371 per cent, the taxable values of property supporting education in the great cities of America in those same thirty years have risen about 90 per cent. In the big cities of America, the school population steadily increases; the total population steadily decreases. These are facts. These are unhappy statistics. What we might call the "good" people, the favored people, the middle-class white and Negro people continue to drift out of their cities to be replaced in the city by the old, the deprived, the poor Negroes, and the other minorities. During the past ten years, Cleveland, for example, suffered a population decrease of 4 per cent. During this same period the school population increased 28 per cent. St. Louis lost 12 per cent of its population, and with this went the taxes and the concern and the civic responsibility. It gained 31 per cent in school enrollment during the same period. Similar testimony can be presented for most of the large cities. Where are our values on these things? What are we going to do about it?

Let me say here that it is extremely important not to stereotype the Negro child. He is like any other child. He is a product of many forces, some of them evil, some of them good. He is a child that can flower and prosper like any other child, given the pattern. But the setting in many cases is very ugly. We have a task and a problem, and it is we, the people who profess to be teachers, who must carry out the task and solve the problem. It cannot be solved in the immediacy of the issues we call to-

day *integration* and *compensatory education*. These are the two forces that are aimed at the child of deprivation, and this includes all of the children of deprivation, many, but by no means all, of whom in the cities are Negro.

Look again at this business of integration *vis-à-vis* compensatory education. In either case we are talking about a generation in time. The past four-and-one-half years of my life have been devoted to searching for solutions in both directions with able scholars, not only from our own present faculty but from those across the land who in one way or another, particularly with foundation encouragement, we have endeavored to involve in the problem-solving of large issues in Pittsburgh. We have not been able to discover any quick solution to racial integration in the schools. I would say that we have devoted the utmost earnestness, goodwill, and commitment — the faculty, the Board of Education, and the community — to this issue. Furthermore, compensatory education, as the other alternative to the problem of the big cities, is a very, very slow and frustrating and, at this stage, barely discernible promise on the course that we are following. But both of these forces — nonthreatening, deliberate, and conscious *racial integration* and a massive infusion of *compensatory education* programs and services — in my judgment, must be the course of action if big cities are to survive.

I will not argue the matter of integration from its civil rights viewpoint nor even from the viewpoint of the sociologists who have come lately to these troubled waters. I simply say that a little boy or a little girl who grows up feeling different from other people and is unable to have access to solutions that would lift him out of his excluded and isolated way of life has every reason to be sick, to be desperate, to be incomplete as a human being. I say this as a school teacher and not a social scientist. And I see what can happen to boys and girls when they see no light at the end of that corridor. I also see what can happen to them when the light begins to show. They are just like other boys and girls, given the opportunities they have not had. The public schools of America have substantially failed, in my judgment, to reach perhaps

what might be called the lower 20, 25, 30 per cent of our population — in terms of socioeconomic, in terms of cultural, in terms of academic, environment, offerings, capacities, resources.

The disorganization of the families from which so many of these children come must ultimately be resolved before these children will be whole. The schools have a responsibility in this direction never before contemplated. And that is why I say that we are talking about a generation in time, not tomorrow, not integration next week nor next year, and not compensatory education which, suddenly, through a team teaching program or improved class size, is going to solve little Joe's problems next week. There is virtually nothing in the evidence so far, in terms of scientific evaluation, that shows, in the short time the Great Society has been upon us, that children can quickly, suddenly, emerge whole.

I look at this process of the child's becoming a whole person as his coming to school at age three in the preprimary program and spending two years, before entering kindergarten, in an eleven-month, at least four-hours-a-day program, in an environment which is civilized, sensitive, clean, loving. And I see him proceeding from there into kindergarten and then first grade and the twelve-year spectrum of the school, and, by the end of that time, some fourteen or fifteen years will have passed. And I see him graduating from high school and having the opportunity to go on to at least two years of community college. During this time he will have made his choices as to whether he will go into higher education or directly into the world of work; many can go into the world of work following high school or following Grade 14 and further study in a technical institute. Then I see a year or two of work and development, responsibility, earning power, dignity, self-respect, and then the start of a family. And that brings us to about twenty-two or twenty-three years of age. Then I see starting another family, and I see the child of that child coming under the influence of school in a posture wholly different from that of his father or mother. The family has earned dignity and self-esteem. Through education it has worked its way out of the ghetto, out of despair, out of hopelessness, and out of anger. We are talk-

ing about 25 or 26 or 27 years for that cycle to complete itself. Anything less than that is unrealistic speculation.

I am going to run through some of the things that our staff in Pittsburgh does in the category of compensatory education. Not that this list will, in any way, be a complete one of all the things we are doing, but I am going to give you some highlights.

Since 1961 we have been engaged in team teaching in Pittsburgh in about 40 schools, representing most of the schools in our deprived neighborhoods. Team teaching for us means a much greater freedom of structure within a classroom where there are perhaps a hundred children in Grade 3 in a school instead of three teachers with 33 children each. The team teaching method employs the services of a leader, three teachers, two or three assistant teachers who are partly trained and are continuing to train, and at least one team mother. Instead of three adults, we are likely to have six or seven deployed in different ways at different times. The team method has many variations even within a given school.

So far, in six years, team teaching has not produced measurable results in terms of any kind of responsible, scientific achievement testing. What it has produced, and what gives us hope, is a much larger interest on the part of families because there are more adults in the school who can relate with families, and this is important. The disorganized family is perhaps a little less disorganized because of the presence of additional responsible adults in the school environment. More children are reading books, not measurably reading them more skillfully, but they are reading more books. This we know. Families are using the public libraries, whereas they have never used them before. Pupil attendance is markedly improved, from an average of 70 to 72 per cent in our most deprived neighborhoods to a conventional 93 or 94 per cent. These are things that are important and show signs of growth, but they as yet do not pay off in the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

In some of our schools we have moved from team teaching into nongraded programs. Nongraded is a popular term, with probably some faddish overtones. To me, the simplest rationale for a nongraded pro-

PS001163

gram is that some children come to us in such deep, crippling circumstances that they cannot begin to compete in any kind of expected arrangements for curricular classifications. They work against their own capacities and aspirations. Very little is accomplished by failing them at the end of Grade 1 because they have not performed the work of Grade 1. We now have nongraded programs in nine schools. The faculties of those schools are enthusiastic about them, and I expect the programs to be adopted in other schools.

Through my descriptions, I think you will perceive that in some ways our program has proliferated in many directions. I expect that this has some weak points and some bad points. But we watch for clues, and if at one school a program shows promise, we try to pursue what has happened there, replicate it, and diffuse it. The experiments that are found to be of little value are halted at once.

One successful experiment in our compensatory education program is what we call a transition room. It has some nongraded overtones, but we had it going before we got into nongraded work. It is a situation that we have in most of our schools serving deprived children. I'll give you a sense of proportion here. About 50 per cent of our schools serve deprived children; that is typical for most cities; many of them are *de facto* segregated. Some of them — half of them, happily — have a reasonable racial balance. The transition room is our own name for a room or class that fits between Grade 3 and Grade 4. It does not have any grade classification, but it does have some characteristics that are constant. The classes are very small, about eight or nine children, at most ten or eleven. Each child is one who is underachieving at the end of Grade 3 and one for whom we make the decision that this child needs everything we can give him. He remains for as long as it takes him to get ready for the demands of the intermediate grades. That is a large order. We do not place in this group a child who would be considered in need of special education. Instead, this would be a child who we judge can make it, given the right environment. Sometimes he is in the transition room for only five or six weeks.

In the transition room, there is a specially trained teacher with almost unlimited resources. Strong psychological services, strong psychiatric services, and strong counseling and family-related services are focused sharply on these eight or ten youngsters. Sometimes the youngster spends a year or more there before he can graduate. But out of this program have come some real satisfactions and some promise. It is one of the things on which we place high hopes.

These children change in their measurable learning rate. They have been learning perhaps at a rate of a measurable grade equivalent score (which I admit is a very crude way of measuring, but the best we have) of four or five months a year or four or five decimal points on the scale of the achievement tests. Typically, in reading and arithmetic in particular, they have doubled and, in many cases, tripled their learning rate during a span in the transition room. Having been graduated from the transition room, very few youngsters go back to it. It is a very pleasant experience for them. They like it, but they must make room for others. This is one innovation that is paying off, partly because of deep concern on the part of teachers and principals (and concern is extremely important) and partly because of just massive investment.

Now you can say it is simply a matter of small classes. Well, it probably is. In big cities today, the fund situation is desperate in spite of the federal funds that we hear about; federal funding represents only about 7 per cent of the costs of education. The operating budgets of the big city schools use up that much in just one year of normal increase in salaries and replacement of books. So there is no large federal investment yet for the deprived, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act notwithstanding. Under the desperate conditions of finance, most of our classes average 30, 32, 33; and this is typical throughout the land. We have been able to reduce our class size in our deprived communities at great investment to an average of about 28. Even so, you know full well that, for the child who is a very incomplete human being at age nine or ten, a class of 28 is not small enough. Here we have poured on all the power we can.

We are also working on other problems. We have intensified greatly our work in speech and hearing. Mobile units staffed with qualified teachers circulate throughout the city, spending a day at each school. A child spends 30 minutes each week on a planned program. With three mobile units, each containing three or four cubicles, we reach one hundred or more pupils a day. This is still not enough, but it is a long jump forward.

Bringing parents in for preprimary counseling is another important part of what we are doing. Counselors are not usually found at the elementary school level. Not many people are trained for elementary counseling. It is an order of professionalism different from the high school counseling in which the traditional patterns are found. It is principally aimed at relating the school to the parent, attacking the problem of the disorganized home, and helping the family to perceive the school and the child in better ways, in more constructive ways. Sometimes it is very difficult even to make contact with the family.

The program for expectant mothers typically has an enrollment of about 80 girls. In the past, mothers of illegitimate children have been dropouts. At the time of, or a few months before, delivery, they would simply disappear and start another cycle of poverty, of desperation, of hopelessness. Often a grandmother, age thirty-three or thirty-four, a great-grandmother of fifty or fifty-five, and the new mother all lived together. We now have these young women in a separate, very effective school environment where they are not embarrassed by their circumstances. They are given very sensitive medical, psychological, and psychiatric attention. They have their babies, the babies are placed in homes, and the mothers return to classes — but not in the school they formerly attended. This is making a difference.

I am going to dwell for a few minutes on this whole business of preprimary education. Members of our profession are seriously debating the issue of what learnings should be expected of three-, four-, and five-year-old children. The establishment says that learning in Head Start should be in the context of the traditional kindergarten as conceived

around the middle-class family. They would struggle against the more formal learnings that others would press upon the schools for the learnings of early childhood. I think that the issue of whether or not cognitive learning should be included at the kindergarten level is going to have to be resolved. I do not pretend to have the answer to it. But I think that nothing constructive and universal can happen so long as there is a quarrel.

Jerome Bruner and Benjamin Bloom, among others, say that some of the most important growth of the child, not only physical growth but total growth, occurs during his first three or four years, and that learning, cognitive learning, is within the capacity of the child. There are even those who would go so far as to say that it is outrageous that we deny the child these learnings during these years and, instead, deal with the conventional, noncognitive environment of the conventional kindergarten.

As a school administrator, I find the truth somewhere between. I say that the child from the typical middle-class family is learning a great deal in his conventional environment in spite of his school. His experiences and exposures, the very presence of his family, and the things among which he lives are in themselves a rich source of learning — cognitive or not. But a child of deprivation does not have that environment. My position is to say that we must endeavor to find an environment that we can produce around this child of deprivation that will be comparable to the favored child's natural environment. Think of the child who comes to school in the first grade and does not know the meaning of *red* — r-e-d. What a wonderful experience red is for a child, or for an adult for that matter. Red is a wonderful thing to enjoy. Some children do not know what red is in first grade. They have not experienced the meaning and the feeling of the word red. Many of these children come to school with no speech — no speech! They have responded to commands, mostly monosyllabic words not very understandable to anyone, in a noisy, dirty, unhealthy environment; and they start with almost nothing.

We speak of preprimary education — some call it Head Start. We call it preprimary, having started this program in 1961 before there was Head Start; and we continue to call it preprimary even though we are glad to have Head Start money. We now have some preprimary programs typically serving up to 1,300 or 1,400 children throughout our city. All of these children, to qualify for a preprimary program, must be selected as being part of the population of the deprived. But I would also quickly say that although we go out and search for those most deeply deprived, we also bring in a seasoning of some of the less deprived, some who in a given community might be looked upon as more favored. If we have only the deeply deprived, they all know who they are. They all know each other, and if there is no one who is obviously moving upward and who has some slight prestige — little though it may be in that community — the children of the deeply deprived have no ideal to fasten on. We do a little cheating to bring in some more favored people. This is paying off.

We conducted our first preprimary evaluation for three- and four-year-olds enrolled eleven months a year, three hours a day, starting in 1963. These children have now had four years from the time that the little ones were age three. Testing with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test that first year produced a median I.Q. of 84.6 for all of the children in the program. A year later, we tested them again. There was a little gain, but it was not statistically significant. Two years later the median for that group had moved from the middle 80's to 99. This increase was unbelievable; we thought that something was wrong. We did not announce it; our research department continued to study it.

As of last June, with the conclusion of the academic year, in the fourth year of the cycle for some of these children, those that still remained accessible (about 75 per cent, although we had to track them down throughout the city) had an average I.Q. maintained at 99.2. There had been, in other words, an increase of some 15 points in the I.Q., and it was holding for the third year. Last week the results from further scrutiny of these data were in. All of the children who had been

in the program for at least three years and could be examined were re-examined using the Stanford-Binet. The Stanford-Binet produced an average I.Q. of 101 for children who had started on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test at 84.6 three and four years earlier.

This is a significant rise in score. Three hours a day in a civilized environment with quite specific learnings in the curricular goals had produced measurable results that had held up under three successive examinations. We do not know what will happen over the next two or three years. We do know that these children who are now entering Grades 1 and 2 after this experience are performing effectively. What I am saying in brief is that, if we are going to argue about different kinds of schools of philosophy concerning preprimary education, we should look first at what the child of deprivation needs to give him a reasonably fair start as he enters formal education. He seems to need a heavy concentration of teaching and learning with maximum investment of affection and concern.

I have mentioned one large issue surrounding early education, the question as to whether we should truly bear down and begin to teach in the formal sense the three- and four-year-old child of deprivation to fit him for reasonable confrontation with a middle-class first grade. I feel we should. Something must happen to redress, forcefully and with substantial investment, the circumstances of this child of poverty. We can dramatically change his learning and living environment and start him toward effectiveness. I do not much care whether or not the child of the middle class in favored circumstances has a preprimary education through the public schools. He will be taken care of anyway in his normal environment. The child of poverty will not be, and in our big cities he represents 40 to 50 per cent of our population. I hold that we must give the deprived child a chance to compete at Grade 1.

Another issue that I would like you to ponder is that there is considerable doubt today as to whether the established schools are to continue to be held responsible for the emerging and increasing expectations of our society or whether other agencies are — the Office of Economic

Opportunity, the Department of Labor, Litton Industries, General Learning Corporation. I think that if we in the established arrangements for public education are to continue to command the respect of our patrons and of Congress in these emerging expectations — much larger expectations than ever before — then we must have a better product. We must tell our tale far more forcibly. We must demand the resources to perform the work, not at the level of OEO funding, not at the level of Litton Industries funding, not at the level of the Job Corps, which is $7,000 per student per year, but at the level of twice the present funding per child.

We must remember that what we are talking about is a generation in time. Both in terms of the process of growth through education and the integration of our people in the cities — nonthreateningly, deliberately, consciously — education is the path out of the ghetto. Education is a part of the processes of human growth and development, and these processes take time. Education is the ultimate cure for the sickness in the big city, provided the people of America are willing to invest sufficiently in the schools, and to let us do our slow and evolutionary job.